

From: "Ray Kockentiet" To: ; ; Subject: Spam solution lies in better email software?
Date: Thursday, March 11, 2004 12:42 AM I am writing to request a favor. Don't you just love it! That favor is a request for some critical review and feedback on a piece I wrote recently. I have copied it below. Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Best regards, Ray Kockentiet -----

----- It is amazing how some make a mountain out of a molehill. I agree that spam is a nuisance. At worst, spam is an aggravating drain on resources and productivity. However, spam does not require legislative intervention. The problem is poor software design. Most email software contains a "message rule" system. Yet, judging from the hue and cry, current software is failing to meet user needs. Computers increase productivity by making routine tasks easy. Properly designed email systems can triage all incoming email. Better software design will include an easy to use method for building end user-defined computer rules. The computer will then use that rule to triage future email messages from that sender. For example: a.. Top priority. Receipt of this email classification may trigger an immediate on-screen alert. Perhaps messages from the boss, your nine-month pregnant spouse, replies to messages one sent to another that was tagged "high priority," etc. b.. High priority. Contains messages from coworkers and others whose communication is considered very important to daily tasks. c.. Various additional levels of priority. While fewer folders are better, the system allows infinite levels to pre-sort advanced meeting announcements, committee/ meeting notes, HR bulletins, some personal email, whatever. d.. Top priority general mail. Maybe messages from persons deemed worthy of one's attention but rarely critical to daily tasks go here. Perhaps includes new messages from any sender who does not have an email triage-handling rule. At home, it might include all email messages sent to minors from a sender that a parent has not screened or approved. Contents in this folder would be recommended for at least daily review. e.. Other user selected levels of priority general mail. This could contain messages that are read if and when time allows. Emails from that acquaintance that sends you jokes or cartoons end up here. f.. Priority bulk mail. This folder may include personally selected Internet reports or email from message services deemed of interest or importance to one's job functions. At home, items of personal interest go here. g.. Other levels of priority bulk mail. This could offer multiple sorting levels finally filtering down to that porn message or Internet offer one actually wanted! h.. Return to sender. Selecting this classification would initiate an automatic reply message to the sender. The reply informs the sender that all email from them is unwanted. At home, persons sending unapproved email to minors would be immediately put on notice. If the "return to sender" feature was subsequently activated by receiving more email from a previously notified sender, an internal "high priority" message would be generated. For corporate users, the "high priority" message information identifies a potential spammer. For personal users, the message with accompanying abusive sender information could be forwarded to his/her Internet Service Provider (ISP). The ISP could follow-up and if appropriate, pursue sanctions for violation of terms of service agreements. My classification system is illustrative. Corporate Technology Departments are more capable of tailoring suggested "folders" for their employee users. For home use, software designers could offer multiple default settings. The system must be user friendly and very simple to use. It must contain examples in "help" that are understandable by non-tech savvy Americans. To solve the spam problem, America needs to clamor for good software! Properly designed computer

software can virtually end spam. Computers never get tired, annoyed or frustrated telling another computer to bug off! Now will someone please explain to me why we need another law? Ray Kockentiet February 18, 2004